

The Washington Times.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1901.

PUBLISHED BY THE

THE HUTCHINS BUILDING

PENNsylvania AVENUE

Subscription by Mail—One Year:

Morning, Evening, and Sunday.....\$6.00

Morning and Sunday.....\$4.00

Evening and Sunday.....\$3.00

SUNDAY ONLY.....\$1.00

Monthly by Carrier:

Morning, Evening, and Sunday.....Fifty cents

Morning and Sunday.....Thirty-five cents

Evening and Sunday.....Twenty-five cents

SUNDAY ONLY.....Ten cents

THE TIMES COMPANY,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Circulation Statement.

The circulation of The Times for the week

ended October 19, 1901, as follows:

Sunday, October 19, 1901.....39,372

Monday, October 19, 1901.....38,824

Tuesday, October 20, 1901.....38,276

Wednesday, October 21, 1901.....37,728

Thursday, October 22, 1901.....37,180

Friday, October 23, 1901.....36,632

Saturday, October 24, 1901.....36,084

Total.....235,172

Daily average (Sunday, 39,372, excepted).....36,294

Tariff Reform.

The "Chicago Record-Herald" quotes

Representative Babcock as expressing

the belief that his bill removing duties

from the tariff is the best thing that

Congress does not adopt a plan of

tariff reform, the people will next year.

The reasons for Mr. Babcock's confidence

that Congress will act favorably are

not given, and it is more than likely

that it comes from his clear perception

of the merits of such a measure.

The proposal is so manifestly just that

he can scarcely contemplate the possibility

of Congress refusing to take

favorable action upon it. If this is his

sole reliance it is to be feared that he

is taking entirely too much for granted.

Considerations of justice are not wholly

without weight with Congress, but, unfortunately,

they generally have been counted

for very little when the tariff has

been the subject of legislation. About

four years ago, when Mr. Babcock was

a member of the House, he expressed

a direct approval of his measure or of

any analogous proposition. There

have been a few vague generalities

pointing in that direction, but nothing

more. With very few exceptions the

recognized leaders of the Republican

party have scouted the idea of enacting

any such measure. Still, the Wisconsin

Representative may possibly be some

knowledge of which we are not advised.

The latter portion of his statement,

however, is very significant. If Congress

does not act, the people will next

year, says Mr. Babcock. This presents

the matter in a different light. Evidently

he has been feeling the public

pulse, and there can be no question as

to how it has responded to this subject.

There has not been a time in many

years when the tariff figured as strongly

as it is likely to in the next election

if Congress fails to take action along

the lines of Mr. Babcock's bill. And

the position of the tariff reformers will

be stronger, politically, than it has been

in recent years. Never have the abuses

of the tariff been so glaring as they

are now. The struggle will be for the

elimination of abuses, and not for the

overthrow of the protective system in

its entirety. As matters stand it

will hardly be possible for the leaders

of the Republican party to frighten the

people with the spectre of free trade.

All of the people cannot be fooled all

of the time, nor can even a majority of

them.

If there is not great room for reform

in our tariff laws then indeed there is

nothing in politics or statecraft to

which that term can fittingly be

applied. Mr. Babcock perceives it, and so

do many other living Republicans. The

late President McKinley saw it

very clearly. For present purposes it is

a matter of indifference whether his

views have undergone a fundamental

change concerning the tariff principle,

or he simply saw in a clear light the

change in the American industrial situation.

Nothing can be more certain

than that he favored a very substantial

departure from the policy now in

vogue. Although his arguments and

axioms were essentially free trade in

character, it is not necessary to assume

that he was anxious to pull down the

pillars of the temple and destroy the

whole edifice of protection. The situation

does not require us to go so far as that.

But his negotiation of numerous

reciprocity treaties and his urgent

pleas for a policy that would enlarge the

foreign markets for our goods were

distinct admissions that the time had

come for a substantial modification of

a system which, besides doing rank

injustice to our own people, has left us

without a commercial friend in the

world.

Political parties are sometimes in the

greatest danger when superficially their

position appears to be the strongest.

This may be the case with the Repu-

blican party at the present time. It

surely is so if Mr. Babcock is right in

his view. No party can safely under-

take to defend a thing which is palpably

and increasingly wrong, and in

which the masses of the people are

deeply concerned.

Reciprocity Difficulties.

In its October issue "The World's

Work" editorially says:

"Establishing satisfactory reciprocity

relations was at one time the most

urgent of our problems. But now it is

proven that securing the consent of the Senate

to a reciprocity treaty is the most difficult

task that the Administration could undertake.

protective policy had not been carried

beyond the point of enabling the Ameri-

can producer fairly to compete with

foreigners the objections to it would

lose much of their force.

Unfortunately, though, instead of being

intended to enable the American

manufacturer to compete with the for-

eign producer, the tariff has been framed with

a view of excluding foreign competition

and giving the American manufacturer

a complete monopoly. And it does not

even stop here. It affords such an ex-

cess of protection that in many cases

the prices in the home market can be

set so high as actually to cover losses

on sales abroad. It is not likely that

many American goods are sold at a

loss in other countries, but it could be

done on a considerable scale if really

necessary to make an inroad upon the

foreign market. In fact, the extreme

advocates of protection have claimed

that this was being done right along,

and they have sought to justify it by

the plea that we must break into the

markets of other countries. The whole

idea is utterly specious. Obviously

foreign trade on a considerable scale

which involves a loss cannot be desir-

able, for it is just so much subtracted

from the profits realized at home. If

the trade can only be secured by sell-

ing at a loss it can only be held by con-

tinuing to do so, and American manu-

facturers are not in business for any

such purpose. Speaking generally,

there is no doubt a profit upon the

goods sold abroad, although it must

necessarily be much less than is realized

in the home market.

But the particular point is this: The

great trusts are entrenched behind the

tariff. In order to deprive them of any

portion of their unrighteous advantages

affirmative action must be secured. To

billy of Congress, however, is to take

favorable action upon it. If this is his

sole reliance it is to be feared that he

is taking entirely too much for granted.

Considerations of justice are not wholly

without weight with Congress, but, unfortunately,

they generally have been counted

for very little when the tariff has

been the subject of legislation. About

four years ago, when Mr. Babcock was

a member of the House, he expressed

a direct approval of his measure or of

any analogous proposition. There

have been a few vague generalities

pointing in that direction, but nothing

more. With very few exceptions the

recognized leaders of the Republican

party have scouted the idea of enacting

any such measure. Still, the Wisconsin

Representative may possibly be some

knowledge of which we are not advised.

The latter portion of his statement,

however, is very significant. If Congress

does not act, the people will next

year, says Mr. Babcock. This presents

the matter in a different light. Evidently

he has been feeling the public

pulse, and there can be no question as

to how it has responded to this subject.

There has not been a time in many

years when the tariff figured as strongly

as it is likely to in the next election

if Congress fails to take action along

the lines of Mr. Babcock's bill. And

the position of the tariff reformers will

be stronger, politically, than it has been

in recent years. Never have the abuses

of the tariff been so glaring as they

are now. The struggle will be for the

elimination of abuses, and not for the

overthrow of the protective system in

its entirety. As matters stand it

will hardly be possible for the leaders

of the Republican party to frighten the

people with the spectre of free trade.

All of the people cannot be fooled all

of the time, nor can even a majority of

them.

If there is not great room for reform

in our tariff laws then indeed there is

nothing in politics or statecraft to

which that term can fittingly be

applied. Mr. Babcock perceives it, and so

do many other living Republicans. The

late President McKinley saw it

very clearly. For present purposes it is

a matter of indifference whether his

views have undergone a fundamental

change concerning the tariff principle,

or he simply saw in a clear light the

change in the American industrial situation.

Nothing can be more certain

than that he favored a very substantial

departure from the policy now in

vogue. Although his arguments and

axioms were essentially free trade in

character, it is not necessary to assume

that he was anxious to pull down the

pillars of the temple and destroy the

whole edifice of protection. The situation

does not require us to go so far as that.

But his negotiation of numerous

reciprocity treaties and his urgent

pleas for a policy that would enlarge the

foreign markets for our goods were

distinct admissions that the time had

come for a substantial modification of

a system which, besides doing rank

injustice to our own people, has left us

without a commercial friend in the

world.

Political parties are sometimes in the

greatest danger when superficially their

position appears to be the strongest.

This may be the case with the Repu-

blican party at the present time. It

surely is so if Mr. Babcock is right in

his view. No party can safely under-

take to defend a thing which is palpably

and increasingly wrong, and in

which the masses of the people are

deeply concerned.

Reciprocity Difficulties.

In its October issue "The World's

Work" editorially says:

"Establishing satisfactory reciprocity

relations was at one time the most

urgent of our problems. But now it is

proven that securing the consent of the Senate

to a reciprocity treaty is the most difficult

"sacrifice" which, from being applied

to a sacred rite, has come to be used

in advertising dry goods sales. The Ro-

mans, so far as the works of their

greatest authors bear testimony, were

never guilty of this sort of thing, and

it seems rather inconsistent for a peo-

ple whose forefathers were so devoted to

the sacredness of their religion to have

allowed themselves to be so easily led

by a London trader, however, declares

that neither scarcity of rain nor plagues of

rats nor locusts will account for the

recurrence of famine in India; that

the real responsibility lies in the

door of the viceroy who, as grain mer-

chants, and are nearly all rich and

of them very rich. The poor farmer,

whose crop has failed, comes to one of

the great landlords and gets only a

share of the next year's crop must be

handed over, the viceroy only undertaking

to supply a little food in return and per-

mitting the seed for the following year,

the viceroy is to be held responsible for

the famine. Thus the viceroy holds his grain year

after year, and in the year of famine

he is to be held responsible for the

famine. This is a very curious and

unjust system, and it is not likely that

the viceroy will be able to do much to

relieve the famine. The viceroy is to

be held responsible for the famine, and

the viceroy is to be held responsible for

the famine. This is a very curious and

unjust system, and it is not likely that

the viceroy will be able to do much to

relieve the famine. The viceroy is to

be held responsible for the famine, and